

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-86 are pending claims. Claims 30, 47-64 and 81-86 are currently under consideration. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks. Issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed below in the order they appear in the Office Action.

1. The Examiner objected to the word “described” in the abstract. In response, Applicant has amended the abstract to obviate the objection.

2. Claims 47, 52, 57, 61, 83-86 are objected to because the Examiner considered the claim recitation “transgenic knockout mouse” should be more appropriately “transgenic mouse.” In response, Applicant has amended the claims accordingly to obviate the objection.

3. Claims 85-86 are objected to because the Examiner found each of them to be a substantial duplicate of claim 57 and 61, respectively. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that claim 85 and 86 differ in scope from claim 57 and 61, respectively.

Claim 85 differs from claim 57 in that the candidate agent for FcRn-mediated drug stability is “formulated with a trackable composition” in claim 85 and “attached to a trackable composition” in claim 57. Therefore, claim 85 covers methods in which a candidate agent is itself trackable without being attached to a trackable composition. For example, a candidate agent may be detectable with an antibody that recognizes it. Claim 86 differs from claim 61 in that in claim 61, the first and the second trackable formulation is given to a first and a second transgenic mouse, respectively, whereas in claim 86, the first and the second trackable formulation is given to a single transgenic mouse. Therefore, claims 85 and 86 differ from claims 57 and 61, respectively. Applicant has explained the above reasoning in a telephonic interview with the Examiner on October 5, 2004 and the Examiner found the reasoning plausible. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 30, 47-64 and 81-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to obviate the rejections.

Applicant submits that these amendments overcome the rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Claims 47-56, and 81-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is mostly nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses. However, solely to expedite prosecution, Applicant hereby cancel claims 47-56 and 81-84. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims of similar scope in a future application.

Applicant notes that although the Action states that claims 57-60 and 85 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, it did not give any reason for such rejections. In a telephonic interview with the Examiner on October 5, 2004, Applicant asked for an explanation for the rejections and the Examiner again gave no reason for such rejections. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 617-951-7000. If a extension of time is required, Applicant's attorney respectfully requests that such extension be granted and any fee required be charged to Deposit Account No. 18-1945, Order No. JMY-P01-002.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 6, 2004

Customer No: 28120
Docketing Specialist
Ropes & Gray
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617-951-7000
Fax: 617-951-7050



Weishi Li
Reg. No. 53, 217